HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL
OF RELIGION

# India Cultures Quarterly

*1960 QUARTER FOUR*

# The India Cultures Quarterly

*Editor :* Dr. R. D. Immanuel
Leonard Theological College
Jabalpur 1 M. P., India.

**Vol. 18** **Fourth Quarter** **No. 4**
1960.

## CONTENTS

| | | PAGE |
|---|---|---|
| 1. | NOTICE | 98 |
| 2. | THE ETERNAL FEMININE | 99 |
| 3. | HOW SHOULD WE STUDY OTHER RELIGIONS ?<br>*Dr. H. H. Presler, M. A., Ph. D.* | 100 |
| 4. | WHAT IS BHAKTI MARG ?<br>*P. A P. Tripathi* | 113 |
| 5. | SOME HISTORICAL REFUTATIONS OF THE MAYAVADA<br>*Dr. R. D. Immanuel* | 119 |
| 6. | BOOK REVIEW | 123 |
| 7. | TIRUKURAL ( A New Translation )<br>*Dr. R. D. Immanuel* | 124 |

# THE INDIA CULTURES QUARTERLY

*Editor:* DR. R. D. IMMANUEL

**Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur M.P., India**

**Vol 18** **FOURTH QUARTER 1960** **NO, 4**

## NOTICE

Our procedure with respect to renewals may be explained for the mutual benefit of magazine and subscriber.

**1. India Subscriptions**

Subscriptions to addresses in India are automatically renewed unless the reader informs us in advance. The renewal is sent V. P. P., after first having sent the subscriber a printed notice to expect the same. Some subscribers, on receiving the expiration notice send us their subscription fees by Money Order which is appreciated by us and saves V.P.P. charges. But the time factor sometimes creates confusion. The subscriber may send his subscription to us about the same time we are mailing out the current issue, so that the two cross in the mails. On the one hand, we receive the Money Order, and on the other hand the subscriber receives the V.P.P. Some subscribers have thus paid twice, and we are sorry for this inconvenience to them. In this case, we enter their subscription for two years. Others have refused the V.P.P, because of having sent their Money Order, which is proper to do. It would seem, therefore, that the best way to avoid this inadvertency would be for the subscriber to send his Money Order (if that be his wish) very soon after receiving the expiration notice. If he be willing to receive the V.P.P. he should not send us a Money Order.

**2. Foreign Subscriptions**

These are automatically renewed unless the reader informs us in advance. We mail the expiration notice early, and then send a bill with the first issue of the new annual subscription. Both come by sea mail which takes considerable time (about six weeks). Here again communications cross in the mails. A subscriber in Europe sent us a subscription for three years in advance and later received our bill for one year's subscription. Each of us wrote to the other at about the same date. In such a case the European subscriber should ignore the bill. The same is true for our subscribers in South America and in North America. Kindly recognize the time factor and understand that a bill received from us may not necessarily mean that we have failed to receive and record your welcome renewal in the meantime.

**3. All Subscribers**

Please show or mention the INDIA CULTURES QUARTERLY to your like-minded friends and associations. Help this non-profit effort to disseminate knowledge of the peoples of the earth.

## THE ETERNAL FEMININE

Saivaism is full of the idea of the Eternal Feminine expressed in sculpture, painting and poetry. One of the most famous of such sculptures is found, in South India as the idol of the temple of **Artha nari ishwar.** The last word literally means "half woman God" The eternal feminine in deity is thus expressed by giving Siva a lady who not only is His consort but is actually a part of him. Here is a poem written about 650 A. D. by the Tamil poet Sambandar translated into English by Kingsbury and Phillips:–

He is our only lord, conjoined still
To her whose breast no suckling lips have known.
They who in Annamali's holy hill,
Where falling waters noisy chatter down,
And the hill glistens gem-like, bow before
Our great one who is lord and lady too,
Unfailingly for them shall be no more
Dread fruit of good and bad deeds they may do.

## HOW SHOULD WE STUDY OTHER RELIGIONS ?

Dr. HENRY H. PRESLER.

Note :—*The writer of this article brings to our readers some answers given at the Tenth International Congress for the History of Religions held at Marburg, West Germany, Sept. 11—17, 1960, He was one of a team of five sent to represent India.*

Ever since the first Parliament of Religions in 1893, students of religions have wrestled with the question posed at the head of this article. The Tenth International Congress ended in 1960 on the same basic question faced in 1893, but with some new answers. The final day was devoted entirely to a consideration of recent proposals, but it proved impossible to reach any opinion upon which all could agree. Indeed, the Congress was adjourned by the president's ruling that it would be impossible in the time allowed to hear all who wished to debate the question. In the nature of scholastic argument, no voting was possible on the fundamental question: How should one study other religions ? But the Congress clearly saw and bravely struggled with the really fundamental issue of religious inquiry. This made it one of the great conferences in the experience of many of us.

Of course, there were other features of the Congress that excited attention, but none were able to cover up the basic perplexity. For example, there was Prince Mikasa of Japan, His Imperial Highness, who opened the Congress, leading his team of twenty delegates. There were some 550 delegates from 29 countries of the world. One hundred and forty different lectures proceeded in ten different classrooms of the University of Marburg during the mornings, and eight general lectures graced the afternoons. There was an excursion to the Marburg Castle in which Luther and Zwingli once met to try to compose

their differences as to the doctrine of the Eucharist, and another to Fulda where St. Bonifiace centered his missionary offort among the Germans. It was interesting to see the scholars who have written the major texts in the History of Religions field and to hear them lecture. It was wonderful to sit in the German **Gasthauser** before plates of **Wienerschnitzel**, and discuss various approaches to one's own major field of interest. But these features only pointed up more sharply the basic disagreement on the fundmental question. How can a Christian, for example, study Hinduism, with a fair prospect of coming to know what it is objectively and subjectively ?

### Linguistic Ability

One was immediately impressed with the tremendous efforts made by the delegates to solve the problem. Take their linguistic ability, for example. The chairman of the Marburg committee, Prof. Friederic Heiler, addressed the delegates in eight languages : English, French, German, Italian, Swedish. Greek, Latin, and Japanese. Many of the delegates spoke English, French and German ( indicating a wide acquaintance with the literature relating to religions ), and one Oriental language. I heard a German and an English professor speak to each other in Sanskrit. One professor spoke Turkish, read Arabic and Sindhi, in addition to the three major European languages. I watched a near-East scholar discuss a text by writing on the blackboard in Greek, Aramaic, Syriac and Hebrew, while lecturing in German which was not his mother tongue. Yet, excellence in philology had not persuaded them that they were as close to the heart of the religion being studied, as they would wish.

### Historical Interest

As a matter of fact, the 10th International Congress represented the contemporary expression of a scholarly interest in other religions, reaching back into antiquity. Among the

ancient Romans, Tacitus ( 75-120 A. D. ) made a serious attempt to study the religions of the Eastern peoples. The Gnostics in 150 a. d. included Basilides, 130 A. D., and Valentinus, 150 A. D. who were interested in the problem.

The Alexandrians in 250 A. D. contrasted Christianity wtih other faiths and compared them. In the Middle Ages. Roger Bacon ( 1214-1294 A. D. ) tried to classify and compare the existing religions of mankind. Nicolaus of Cusa ( 1401-1464 ) tried to bring order out of the many forms of belief.

In the East, a Tartar despot named Mangu ( 1200-1259 A.D. ) called an assembly of representatives of Islam, Nestorian Christianity, and Buddhism. He instructed the speakers to be temperate in tone, and threatened that any delegate who ventured to allude disrespectfully to a different religion than his own, would do so at the risk of instant death. Akbar the Great in India (1542-1605 A. D.) collected the scriptures of religions, held frequent conversations with men of different faiths, and even promulgated a new religion which combined what he considered to be the best in eaeh

## Science of Religions

What the ancients began, what men of the Middle Ages attempted, has been tried down to modern times by a network of scholars, notably in Europe. They have coined a new name for it : **Religionswissenschaft,** the science of religions. This discipline starts from presuppositions which are different from the principles of theology. Theology starts with convictions, statements about religious truth which result from revelation and which are accepted as worthy of belief by the faithful. Moreover, theology feels obliged to serve the very religion it is systematizing. **Religionswissenschaft,** on the contrary, came into existence by emancipation from theology, and is under no obligation to serve a religious community, and turns its energies to frec inquiry, following the facts wherever led. This means that the method

of **Religionswissenchaft** is unique. By this method the historical development of the religions of the world, both past and present of the extinct and living religions, is regarded disinterestedly, and objectively, just as one might trace the development of the irrigation system of Malayan rice cultivators. This means that a religion comes under the scrutiny of outsiders, who need have no convictions about it. They may believe in some religion, or they may not. But they must examine and analyze the history of religions according to the method of so-called scientific history.

( Here, I insert an important parenthesis. Some of us social scientists maintain that history can not become scientific because it studies the unique, and to some extent, non-repeatable; science, on the other hand, studies the general and repeatable. In our view, history is an art, not a science. But the **Religionswissenchaft** people maintain that history is a science, and the Tenth International Congress represented, in the main, their viewpoint ).

The proposition that religions can be studied objectively and dispassionately as a curious phenomenon characteristic of human society, has laid hold of the minds of Europeans, especially those of the Protestant tradition. The Roman Catholics sent representatives to hear what was said, but in the main, the Protestants were looking at religion much as a biologist looks at "the bug on the pin." One might toy with the idea that **Religionswissenschaft** represents an advanced stage of the Protestant ethos, which began by questioning this or that doctrine, and viewing religion with pure objectivity.

### University Ideology

In any case, this was the central concept underlying the Tenth International Congress, a concept which has laid hold of the minds of so many European scholars, possibly because theological education has been dominated by their universities. The universities have theological faculties, and those faculties have been paid by

the government, not by the Church, As university professors, some theologians may have been caught up in the scientific spirit of a modern university which regards nothing as sacrosanct. The university glorifies free inquiry, and the theologians, some of them, have directed the university spirit at religion. But in other parts of the world, such as in the U. S. A., the Church has created theological seminary for its own purposes. The seminary faculty is brought into being in order to teach and defend Christianity, just as, for example a Buddhist monastery in Tibet was created to maintain that religion. The upshot is that the European university theological faculty may contain men who are dominated by the university, although not always so; the American theological seminary, for example, contains men who may be Christians first, and scholars second.

It seems to me that the invasion of objective science into European theological faculties was never intended by the founders of those universities, who were Roman Catholics. The universities of Europe were, in the main, created by the Church of the Middle Ages in order to teach and defend Christianity. When the Protestant Reformation broke the power of the Roman Church, it neglected to follow out its own promises to their logical conclusions. The Protestants should have come out of the Roman Catholic church buildings, and constructed sanctuaries whose architecture suited their own doctrines; this they did not do, and installed a doctrine and musicology never intended for those edifices; this incongruity continues down to the present. Secondly, the Protestant Reformers should have taken theological education away from the universities come under the power of the State, or they should not have allowed the universities to become State institutions. They did neither, and the result was that the already sceptical frame of mind of Protestants united with the scientific inquiry of the physical and biological sciences, with the result that **Religionswissenschaft** became a possibility and then an actuality.

Now it impressed me that the leaders of the Tenth International Congress were members of the theological faculties of European universities, and represented the point of view **Religionswissenschaft,** to wit, that religions are to be studied dispassionately. They represented what should be recognized as a large and growing movement on the theological horizon, one that began in earnest generations ago.

The masters of the movement are well-known names to students of religions. In Great Britain there were F. Max Muller ( 1823—1900 A. D. ), the Sanskrit scholar who gave to the world the famous Sacred Books of the East translated into English. There was William Robertson Smith ( 1846—1894 A. D. ) whose book **The Religion of the Semites,** is a classic in the B. D. curriculum today. There was Andrew Martin Fairbairn ( 1838—? ) whose Barrows and Gifford Lectures did much the spread the inquiry. In Holland there were government chairs of comparative religion. France, Belgium, Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, and even Italy, produced scholars of renown in the field. American universities ( notably Harvard, Yale, Chicago ) have been pioneers in the investigations discussed at the Tenth International Cangress. Since 1950 the movement has been recognized in Japan, Korea, and finally, in 1960 Indian efforts were recognized with the formal admission of the Indian Branch into the International Association. The adherence to the **Religionswissenschaft** school of some Japanese scholars may be better understood by persons acquainted with the collapse of the doctrine of emperor worship, and the resultant intellectual confusion; it may be that some Japanese are resolved to hold belief in abeyance until investigating the nature and meaning of religion objectively. As for India, the opinion that all religions are the same, or paths to the same goal, makes it possible for religions born in India to welcome the objective study of them all.

### Religious Science in the Orient

At present, there are seven thousand members actively engaged in the inquiry, and their central office and triennial

gatherings have been financed by UNESCO and the governments concerned. To help you to estimate the way in which **Religionswissenschaft** has laid hold of some minds in the traditionally pious East, I shall summarize the remarks of Prof. Kishomoto, who is secretary for the Far Eastern affairs of the International Association. In his lecture entitled, "An Operational Definition of Religion," he maintained that the method for studying religions should be scientific, objective, open and available to all. Values should be left out of consideration, or least, neutral. The Phenomena to be studied should be religious and social activities, and devoid of any ontological questions ( that is, we should not ask, Does God exist ? Rather, we should ask, How does man think of God ? ). As a matter of fact, religion need not include God, but atheistic forms of Buddhism and Humanism should be recognized as religion. Religion may be defined, he said, as an effort to save the problem of man, and religious institutions have one peculiar feature, namely, they claim to have the absolute Answer, and to offer an infinitely great saving power. Medicine, economics, politics offer limited solutions, religion claims to have an ultimate solution. In other words, religion is a cultural institution believed to offer to participants the elucidation of the ultimate meaning of life and to give the ultimate solution to the human problem.

That such a dispassionate and analytical viewpoint should have laid hold of the thinking of an Oriental, is something new under the sun, It happened after the defeat of Japan and the eclipse ( permanent or temporary, who can say ? ) of Shintoism. It mustered enough following among Japanese professors to make the admission of a Japanese Association to the **Religionwissenschaft** fraternity possible in the year 1950.

### Methodological Cleavages

The problem of how to study a religion other than your own, was not to be solved within the International Association, however. When you begin to view religion with a cold and calcula-

ting eye, you also begin to view your method so. It was not long until cleavages began to appear in the ranks of the scientifically minded scholars. As the General Secretary of the Congress, prof Bleeker of Amsterdam, remarked, "Actually the Science of religion comprises the history of religions, the sociology of religion, the psychology of religion, phenomenology of religion, and philosophy of religion." The startling statement combines under one heading, five different methods for studying religions, and the common feature is their aim to be objective. But are there not profound differences of methodology between history and sociology ? Is it possible to associate psychology with phenomenology ? Are the methods of history and philosophy the same ?

I recall sitting in a cafe with an anthropologist from Latin America, a delegate to the Congress. He said to me, "What these historically minded people are talking about does not seem to me to be fruitful or relevant; I don't need to know it; I can't take the time to know it because, knowing it, would not give me any significant or meaningful knowledge." Nevertheless, I who teach Cultural Anthropology was thrilled by the meaningfulness and significonce of what the historians were describing. As for the 140 morning lectures, which each delegate sampled, one found himself listening to historians, anthropologists, sociologists, psychologists and philosophers, and each was studying religion differently than the others. If it be argued that one should study religions by all five methods, then this is arguing the impossible, for no man has a specialist's command of all five, and no scholar has the time to read the monographs of all five, or even the so-called "assured results" thereof. ( The interdisciplinary approach is said to be workable, however ). In sum, the Congress appeared to be a combination of earnest and sincere men, of able and devoted scholars, divided among various sciences, and having little to do with one another's methods. That this is not my own interpretation is proven by the recognition of the fact by the General Secretary. In his paper reserved for the full assembly on

the closing day, he stated frankly that the future task of **Religionswissenschaft** is to settle the question, How should one study religions ?

### Occident and Orient

In fact, a full half day was devoted to discussing this question, and without reaching any conclusion. First, it was sought to be shown that there is a fundamental difference between the Oriental and the Occidental methods of studying religions. It was claimed that the Orient comes to an understanding of religions by intuition, mysticism, experience; whereas the Occident tries to study religions scientifically, objectively, dispassionately. The East tries to know religion as from the inside; the west tries to know it by looking at it from the outside, tracing its historical development, analyzing it psychologically and so on. There was a spate of Western speakers who mentioned this supposed difference, and then the professorial head of the Japanese delegation, and the head of the Indian delegation, a Hindu monk, were asked to give their opinions. Unfortunately for the previous speakers, the Japanese professor talked as scientifically as the Westerners, and the Swami said that India had no difficulty with the scientific method, but welcomed it.

### W. C. Smith's View

A second proposition indicates that the leaders of the Tenth International Congress are themselves evolving a new conception of **Religionswissenschaft,** by considering an article byProf. W. C. Smith on "Comparative Religion : Whither and Why ?" Briefly his argument runs like this: "This traditional form of Western scholarship in study of other men's religions was that of an impersonal presentation of an 'it' The first great innovation in recent times has been the personalization of the faiths observed, so that one finds a discussion of 'they.' Presently the observer becomes personally involved so that the situation is one of a 'we', talking about a 'they'. The next step a dialogue, where

'we' talk to 'you'. If there is listening and mutuality, this may become a 'we' talking with a 'you'. The culmination of this process is when 'we all' start talking with each other about 'us'. In explaining this argument, Smith departs from the customary detachment of **Religionwissenschaft.** Instead of the academic tradition of detachment, we now have a new religiously related scholarship carrying out studies by religious people for religious people. "What has been a description is therefore in process of becoming a dialogue. That means that we study religion by interogating each other about our religious conception". According to Smith, the consequence could be that a statment about a religion, in order to be valid, must be intelligible and acceptable to those within. In order to be sincere and of any use, it must be also intelligible and acceptable to the outsider who makes it. It is the business of comparative religion, Smith declares, to construct statements about religion that are intelligible within at least two traditions simultaneously."

In other words, we seem to have gone around the clock and are approaching our starting point, to wit : At the beginning of the hour, mediaeval universities were started by the Church for the teaching and defence of the Christian religion, and that afforded one answer to the question as to how to study religions. By the first quater of the hour, the protestant Reformation broke the power of the Church and transfered the universities to the State, and the teaching of theology became a State enterprise. By half past of the hour, the coldly analytical methods of the university had invaded some theological faculties, and produced a few professors who sought to turn the study of religion into the scientific realm. Now at forty-five minutes of the hour, there comes a serious question as to whether this "bug on the pin" mentality is able to arrive at a true understanding of religion, and a man like Smith hints that after all you can't understand any religion unless you also believe and experience it.

## Present Position

This brings me to a consideration of whether the scholars at the Tenth International Congress were committed to some religion or religions. Or, were they standing off and looking at the "bug on the pin ?" Were they studying an "it ?" I suppose nobody knows the proper answer, because the question was never asked. One can only recall the sample one met, without knowing wether it was an adequate sample. One can recall the verbal and written statements of the lecturers, and try to form some opinion.

As to the sample contacted by me, I found three types of scholars in the 10th International Congress :—

1 The largest number met by me were men who believed in all religions. They recognized truth wherever found, and admired and respected religious experience in any religion. But they were not committed unreservedly to any particular religion.

2. The second largest group consisted of earnest men who believe in one religion as a matter of personal conviction and experience, They were there principally as teachers in the History of Religions field. anxious to learn what others had to say on subjects of mutual interest. These professors may be subdivided into two classes.

(a) Some of them believed that whereas they were committed to one religion, that every religion is of value to its adherents, and it would not be wise to tamper with the loyalties of others.

(b) There were others who were not only committed to one religion but engaged in the business of winning others to it. In other words, there were missionaries representing several religions. There were Orientals to Europe to win adherents, and there were Occidentals living in the Orient to win adherents.

3. Finally, there were men who did not believe any religion whatever, but found the subject highly interesting. **Religionwissenchaft** challenged them.

Now if you ask me what percentage was in each of the three classes, again I plead ignorance of the facts. My own sample indicated about seventy five percent in the first class ( those who believed in all religions ), twenty percent in the second class (those who believed in one religion), and maybe five percent in the third class (those who believed no religion).

The problem of how to study religions was pointed up by the presence of an atheist whose book on Islamic mysticism is widely heralded in the book reviews. This atheist happens to be a Westerner. It so happened that this Westerner and I and an Easterner were thrown together, and the Westerner volunteered the information, 'I am an atheist, you know.' We stared in astonishment, and I said, "But I thought you wrote that book on Islamic mysticism." He said, "Oh yes, I wrote it. Mysticism is a curious and interesting phenomenon. The study of it has provided me with an opportunity to review some of the wise and foolish aspects of human behavior." Then the Oriental said, "I can't understand how you could write about mysticism if you don't believe in God. How can you possibly know or understand or comprehend the nature of mystical experience if you yourself have never had that experience ?"

## The Basic Question

This little story puts the problem of how to study other religions, in a nutshell. Can one understand a religion which he does not espouse ? Prof. Bleeker gives his opinion as follows: "The study of religions of the past leads us to the modest acknowledgement that we never can fully penetrate into their depths and they remain an unveiled secret. That may be also the case with living religions."

Now, as to my own reaction, it may be true that we can never fully understand the religions of the past because we cannot experience them vicariously. Study of the religions of the past may not yield full comprehension of them. As to religions of the present, I feel that we enter into their depths vicariously through prolonged residence in their millieus, in which we throw ourselves continuously into the company of their adherents, with a running dialogue going on over the years.

At the moment this possibility is not generally recognized. There is a run of books professing to let the other religions speak for themselves through their own adherents, on the supposition that they know better about their own faith than do outsiders. But when I go through such books, I am amazed at some portion thereof, which do not tally with the religious realities of, say, mid-India. In considering how such errors could be perpetrated by the adherents of any one religion, I am reminded that perforce the spokesmen must be literate, and that most of them have had an education in English, saturated with ideas other than those of their own religion. They are moved, naturally enough, by considerations of patriotism and national loyalty to overlook some aspects and to emphasize others. Moreover, it is not proven that just because a man is born in a particular religion, that he really knows much about it, as is the case within Christianity itself. Because a man has a name as a philosopher, does not prove that he has had the religious experience of the masses adhering to his own faith. We are too well acquainted with the polemics of inter-faith struggles in which it is shown how thoroughly the non-Christian understands Christianity. I am thinking of one group on the northern border of India whose adherents, according to some of our seminary graduates, know more about Christianity, its meaning and experience, than we do.

In sum, it seems to me that it is not the insider nor the outsider upon whom we must depend for our information about any particular religion. We should depend rather on a man who

resolutely espouses one religion or another, and who has made the study of the other religions not only through a course of reading, but a matter of at least vicarious personal experience.

I close, however, not with any final answer to the question, How to study the other religions? The Tenth International Congress could not arrive at any settled opinion, and the matter must be left on the doorstep of the future.

The same earnest and able delegates and others of the 7000 members of the International Association may be expected to come nearer to the ultimate solution at the Eleventh Congress to be held in India in 1963.

---

## WHAT IS BHAKTI MARGA?

by P. A. P. Tripathi.

Bhakti marga starts from Rigveda. The movement is as old as Hinduism itself is. In its earliest stage it was known as Shraddha bhakti. The same idea is also expressed in Shantiparva of Mahabharath. It is the ultimate reality that led the ascetic to the forest and sustained him through all his disclipinary austerities. But this concept coud not supply the religious need of either the intellectual or the common people. Therefore there arose certain "Rishis" who interpreted bhakti with different meanings. Narada says that "the greatest love in God is bhakti", and he taught aphorisms on Bhakti. Sandilya tried to prove that Bhakti was superior to action ( karma ) or ( gyan ) knowledge. Srimad Bhagavad was considered a very important source of inspiration for the Bhakti of the Bhagavat—school and it was meant as a commentary dealing with the bhakti phase of the Brahma sutras.

The earliest period of bhakti literature has been lost and all our conjectures are based on the development of different strains of thought in later ages. The doctrine of Bhakti has been explained as follows :—

1. **Jivatman** ( the individual soul ) and the **Paramatman** ( the all-soul ) both are different realities. The greatest stage that can be achieved by the individual soul is not absorption in the all-soul but a state in the image of the all soul. Death as such is refuted; life implies eternal activity.
2. **Moksha** ( Salvation ) does not mean Nirvana, but as Bhagavad Kumar Shastri says "it cannot be defined as selfsatisfaction or the mere cessation of worldly troubles, but it must be true joy, eternal joy in the joyous elements of eternal life".

3. **Adhikaris** There is no distinction of caste or creed as is in Gyan marga.

4. **Object of Worship** The object of worship must be eternal and perfect, the one who is the source of life, "Sat Chit Anand." The object of Prabha bhakti is the supreme personal God (Suguna) and he is worshipped in His incarnation which is a divine event. This is through the grace of God as stated in Gita.

5. **Devotion** Devotion is absolute attachment, it is affection. Rememberance of God or knowledge of God does not make real devotion, but complete love of God and full attachment to Him the nature of which cannot be described. However, achievement of this love makes man perfect, satisfied and immortal. One must dedicate his life fully to God and live a simple, prideless life as stated in Gita IV:14 :—

"Ever content, ascetic, self restrained, of firm conviction, with mind and reason dedicated to me — that man is dear to me."

Thus to hear, to contemplate, to honour and to serve the Lord of life was considered whole—hearted devotion. The Ramayana and Mahabharath also played a great part to arouse

the spirit of bhakti in the heart of large populations of India. In the twelfth century A. D. Ramanuja proclaimed that "bhakti was devotion and hero worship to God Who is love, Truth, and Joy."

The modern bhakti movement has lost its origin. The authenticity of the Manusmriti, birth superiority, the authority of the Puranas that had once been given an important place are rejected by most of the modern thinkers. Swami Vivekananda says. "One who does not even think of evil against any one, one who rejoices on the success of his greatest enemy, the same is the real bhakta.

Now it is quite clear that bhakti has been interpreted in different meanings by the different schools of thought, yet the heart of their teachings is a spiritual and strong desire to love God and become one with Him. In the bhakti literature there is a good deal of mythology, cosmology and theology. Often it is difficult for a foreign scholar to evaluate it, in spite of his sincere desire to reach a scientific view, and the same thing is true for most of the young Hindu thinkers.

**The Concept of the Love of God in Bhakti.** Bhakti is a going forth of one's whole personality to God. The Bhagavata Purana says, Whatever a bhakta does with the body or the tongue or the sense or the intellect or the nature which is in accordance with his self, he must consecrate it to the Supreme Narayana. The Bhagavad Gita also says : " He who offers to me with bhakti a leaf, flower, fruit, or water, I accept and eat it. Whatever you do, whatever you sacrifice, whatever you give, whatever penance you do, O Kaunteya ! do all that as offering to me". One of the Tamil Bhaktas who lived before the time of Ramanuja or Bhagavata Purana, says, "We have a longing to draw near Him. That longing is planted in our souls by God Himself, with His help we think of Him steadily and constantly and with love in order to realize that longing. As we do so, He enters our souls, and we keep meditating on Him if He is to remain in us. His

dwelling in our hearts brings with it joy and light and freedom from impurity and release from the ever recurring cycle of births and deaths And we sing and dance filled with rapture because of this experience."

There is a greater emphasis on the love of God in bhaktimarga. Some bhaktas have mystic experiences. As Swami Sivanand says: "Whatever you see is God, whatever you hear is God, whatever you taste is God, whatever you smell is God. This is His manifested aspect." A mystic who is able to see the work of God in nature has a pantheistic view if there is no provision for a personal God. Thus Swami Vivekanand says "God is omnipresent and He reveals Himself in everything." On the other hand Ramanuja-Nimbarka and others stress more on a personal God. Shaivaism and Vaishnavaism do not think of God apart from a personal being. They hold that God is a person Who has feelings and love for His bhaktas. The love of God is the real cause for the incarnation as stated in the Gita : "Whenever right declines, Oh ! Bharata, and wrong uprises. then I create myself. But it is not the love of humanity as a whole, that the incarnations of Vishnu were interested in. The aim was to save the righteous, to establish religion, to kill sinful people. Shaivaites say that God Shiva took poison out of His love for His Bhaktas and they express appreciation for what He had done for them. Kabir says :—"To Thee Thou hast drawn my love O ! Fakir, I was sleeping in my own chamber, and Thou didst awake me. Striking me with Thy voice o ! Fakir ! I was drowning in the deeps of the ocean of this world and Thou didst save me : upholding me with :Thine arm o ! Fakir ! Only one work and no second and Thou hast made me tear off all my bonds, O ! Fakir."

There is another extreme in Bhakti literature which holds that hatred is even superior to love, for Rama killed Ravana and others, Krishna killed Khansa and they all were given salvation.

The concept of the love of God of Madhava is quite different from other Vaisnavaite theologians. He says that God responds to the devotion of bhaktas, but "both knowledge and wisdom and moksha are all the gifts of God" Madhava further says that it is the divine grace that has cast them into the bondage. There are three classes of men: some are predestined to obtain salvation, others are destined to eternal hell, while a third class keeps revolving under the wheel of samsara for eternity. This does not give any message of the love of God but here is expressed the sovereignty of His will.

Thus theologians have uttered contradictions, but we should not pass judgement on individual opinions. Generally all the Hindu bhaktas believe that God out of His love, enables His bhaktas to shake off karma so that they may be able to get freedom from the cycle of births and deaths.

**The Concept of the love of man in Bhakti.**

The bhakti literature is quite rich in the love of human beings for God which has been expressed in various ways such as Jap, Tap, Dan, Yagya, etc. But it is not sufficient for him who experiences God in intimate personal relationship, for as the goodness or value of ghee is judged by the quality of its products, even so is personal experience from the kind of life a man lives.

Generally speaking, the love of men is not the dominant thought in bhaktimarga. Hindus have been divided into castes and creeds. The difference between one man and another man is so much that Ramanuja speaks of "ashrya dosh" by which he meant that if a sinful person comes near to one who is eating, then the person who is eating becomes a sinner because of the sinful person he has seen.

The love of man is taken in a very narrow sense in bhakti literature. God loves the good and destroys the wicked. Bhaktas love their fellow-bhaktas. So sometimes great saints have done away

with the caste system in dealing wlth their co-worshippers. "Be he a brahman, be he a hermit, be he even a sudra, if he knows Krishna's mysteries, he is a guru" says Chaitanya.

Gandhiji took a different position and interpreted bhakti in a wider sense. He interprets the battle of Kurukshetra as the battle between good and evil. It is not a physical battle but a spiritual one. So a spiritual meaning has been attached to it.

Sri Rajanikant Shastri thinks that Hinduism is the cause of the downfall of Hindus. In his book "Hindu Jati ka Uthan aur Pathan" p. 361 he says, "Truly the cause of our downfall is our entanglement in different vain shows of religion which have no sense at all " ( translation ours ) Then he goes on to condemn this religion vehemently and gives as the basis of religion the following :—

Non-violence, universal brother-hood, and true citizenship. In the past bhakti movement, there has not been much evidence of humanitarian work and religious tolerance. But now the Ramakrishna movement is taking an active part in presentiug the love of God by preaching, healing, and doing social work.

*( To be Continued )*

## SOME HISTORICAL REFUTATIONS OF THE MAYA VADA

( a ) What is Maya Vada ?

Maya Vada is the doctrine which maintains that the world is real only empirically, and that ultimately or transcendentally that it is ideal. Sankaracharya did not originate this doctrine, but he developed the idea of his predecessors and gave it a systematic exposition. What he affirms might be briefly summarised in the famous sutra :

"Brahman satyam, Jagam Mithya,
Jivo Brahmaiva na parah".

That is, only Brahman is real. The world is false and the individual soul is none other than the Brahman ( the ultimate reality ). In elaborating this idea, Sri Sankara maintains that the relation between subject and object is illusory and is due to Avidya which is usually translated as nescience or ignorance.

Ignorance is of two kinds – Cosmic and Individual.

The appearance of the world is caused by cosmic ignorance. This is taken as a fact and he gives some very useful illustrations to make clear his position—like the rope appering as a snake ( where the snake is non-existent world ) or a conch shell appearing as a piece of silver. Thus the world is a perversion ( Vivarta ) of Brahman. But the implications of maya ( cosmic ignorance ) are greater. The Ishwar or personal god whom people worship is just phenomenal since the only reality is the subject of consciousness and never the object of any conscious process. It is this denial of the personal God full of good qualities that raised some of the sharpest protests againsts him. Here are a few instances of criticism levelled against him by famous people who were both religionists as well as philosophers :—

## 1. Ramanuja

Ramanuja brought against the doctrine of Mayavada seven charges of inadmissibility. These are the famous **Saptavidha Anupapatti** ( literally, sevenfold inadmissibility ).

( a ) First of all there could be no locus ( ashraya ) for ignorance. The Brahman cannot be the locus as according to Sankara the ultimate reality is self-illumined. It cannot be the Jiva, because Jiva itself is the fictitious part of avidya. Since Brahman is the sole reality and Jiva is ultimately nothing other than Brahman, there is no room for ignorance any where. The only locus it can have is the mind of the man who holds such a doctrine.

( b ) The inadmissibility of the obscuration of the Brahman. If the Brahman by postulate is self-luminous how could it be obscured by maya ? To say that it is self luminous by nature and that it is hidden are contradictory terms. Maya is ultimately unreal. It cannot conceal the ultimately real Brahman.

( c ) The next argument is called swarup anupapatti. According to this the nature of avidya as described by Sankara leads to inadmissible propositions. If avidya is positive, it cannot be rooted out. If it is negative, then it cannot project illusion.

( d ) Again avidya is stated to be indescribable or indefinable, that is, it is neither real nor unreal. To Ramanuja these two terms are not only mutually exclusive but also totally exhaustive. A thing must either be this or that. To say that there is a third possibility is absurd.

( e ) Pramananupapatti is the next argument. That is this doctrine is not arrived at by any logically valid means of knowledge. It is not perceived. The scriptures ( he claims ) do not say any thing about it. It cannot be inferred. So there is no logical proof.

( f ) Nivartakanupapatti. That is if Mayavada is true, there can be no remover of error. Sankara says knowledge of

the unqualified absolute dispels error. But according to Ramanuja knowledge by its very nature involves qualifications. So, the error of Maya ( if there by such ) cannot be removed.

( g ) Nivrttianupapatti or the inadmissibility arising from the impossibility of removing avidya. Suffering is real. Knowledge cannot effect removal. Bhakti, Karma, Prasada etc. are needed.

In sohrt, to Ramanuja, the doctrine of maya is not only logically inexplicable but also factually not workable.

### 2. Madhva

Madhva was a dualist and he accuses Sankara of teaching the false doctrines of Buddhism under the cloak of Vedanta. He was as it were a wolf in sheep's clothing according to this teacher. His reasons against Maya are very similar to those of Ramanuja. They could be summarlzed in three arguments.

( a ) Ignorance or avidya is incompatible with the omniscience of the absolute. God cannot be clouded by ignorance.

( b ) Upadhi is said to be the cause of the ignorance of the empirical self. This is impossible because upadhi itself is unreal.

( c ) Upadhi does not create difference. It just discloses difference. Difference is already there—for there is an eternal difference between man and God, God and the world, and between man and the world.

### 3. Nimbarka

( a ) If Brahman has no quality, ( Nirgun ) how could it be associated with ignorance.

( b ) Ajnana is inexplicable in Mayavada. How could Ajnana have a subject or an object ? If Jiva is the product of Ajnana, it cannot be its locus.

( c ) Brahman is pure light. Ajnana is pure darkness. So the two cannot have any relationship i. e. jointly produce Jiva.

(d) Ajnana has no consciousness. So it cannot operate as an agent of consiousness, which is the claim of mayavada.

(e) Ajnana must exist or not exist. If it exists then mayavada is not monism but dualism. If it does not exsit, then how can it hide the nature of Brahman ?

(f) Brahman must be hidden by Ajnana either in part or totally. But Brahman has no parts. So, it cannot be hidden partly. If it were completely hidden then the world would be total in darkness and there will not be any way out even by the study of mayavada.

### 4. Vallabha

According to Vallabha, Maya is not nescience—but it is the power of the Lord. He criticises Mayavada very much like Nimbarka.

(a) Nescience must have an origination. If the origination is Brahman then Brahman becomes savisesha Brahman and not the qualitiless absolute.

(b) If the Brahman is not the origination then there would be two uncaused causes—a clear-cut case of dualism.

(c) Maya is said to be beginningless but not eternal. This is a contradiction.

(d) Similary, to say that maya is neither being nor non-being involves contradicton.

### Conclusion

Followers of Sankara say that these critics have not disproved the claims of Mayavada satisfactorily and that logic and reason side with Sankara and that most of the difficulties are due to applying spatial categories to spritual entities.

However, heart has reasons, which reason does not know or understand. What the critics are up against so vehemently, is the denial of personality to God. If freedom to man is denied, they are willing to accept it meekly. But if the personality of God is questioned, they attempt to smash the whole argument by every possible means.

## BOOK REVIEW

B. P. Bahirat: The Philosophy of Jnana Deva (Pandharpur Research Society, 1956) pp. 220. Price Rs. 6.

Jnana Deva was a great Maharashtrian, who had a deep religious experience and from that view point expressed in a systematic way his interprtation of reality and religion. But since all his writings were in Marathi his works were not known well to the outside world. He was a rare person in whom the genius of poetry, philosophy and theology were combined. His chief works were, Jnaneshwari, a commentary of Bahagvadgita, Abhangas, that is religious lyrical poems, and Amritanubhava. Tne last one expresses the philosophy of his religious experience and has some important contirbution to give to the philosophy of India. While in the Abhangas one sees the outpourings of his devotional heart it is in Amritanubhava that he finds the real philosopher.

Jnana Deva criticises the great philosopher Sankara's theme of Maya and contends that it is not the Maya but the power of the Lord that is responsible for the appearance of the world. According to him, the love of God is the central reality of the universe and His power and wisdom are only aspects of His love, as he says:

"These (i. e, God and Love) are the two inmates of the universe" I : 13 Amrit.

He compares the relationship between God and Love as the one that obtains between husband and wife, and their relationship is mutually dependent,

"It is through God that the other is goddess and without her the Lord is nowhere. As a matter of fact their existence is due to each other" Ibid I:10.

While a large number of Hindu writers rely on the sacred scriptures for their authority, it is the merit of Jnana Deva that he relies mainly on his own religious experience.

It is not because Shiva or Sri Krishna has spoken this, that we are making our statement. It would have been the same thing if they had not spoken. Ibid III:18. Since there are very few works in English that even allude to this great Maharashtrian poet and philosopher, the appearance of this book is very timely.

The author offered this monograph as his thesis for M.A. degree examination of the University of Bombay. However, some suitable changes and additions have been made and an English rendering of the whole of Amritanubhava is appended. His style is clear and precise and the volume is a welcome addition to any library.

## XLVI. Avoiding Pettiness.

1. Great men should be afraid of petty men; or else they will be surrounded by petty men.
2. Just as (rain) water changes (and becomes impure) when it comes into contact with the soil even so, knowledge is spoiled when contacted with petty people.
3. Through mind knowledge comes. But through his associates, the real man is known.
4. Knowledge reveals what is within the heart and kinship is formed.
5. (Good) environment brings these two :—purity of mind and purity of action.
6. The pure in heart will get good children; if the kinship is good no bad results will follow.
7. A good mind porduces wealth; a good kindred bears every praise.
8. Even if a man's mind is good, it is the beneficience of the kindred that strengthens it.
9. Purity of heart brings forth results in the next world. Even that is strengthened by a man's kindred.
10. There is no better help than a good association, nor a worse evil than bad association

## XLVII. Discerningly Acting.

1. Before any action, calculate the loss, the gain and the final effects that will be accrued thereby.
2. There is nothing hard for anyone to do, if he consults his chosen kinsmen and does it with (clear) insight.
3. The wise will not lose the capital, in order to make a profit.
4. Those who begin anything without discerning clearly, will have to fear infamy.
5. (For a king) to rise up against another (king) without fully calculating all factors is a means of strengthening the enemy.
6. Doing that which should not be done brings ruin; similarly not doing that which should be done.
7. Think before you undertake to do anything. To hope to think afterwards is wrong.
8. Even if many praise it, an unfinished piece of work is ever blamable.
9. Even doing right becomes wrong, if the person to whom it is done is not worthy of it.
10. Consider the fact that the use of unfair means brings infamy in this world.

## XLVIII. Evaluating Ability : ( Strength ).

1. Before undertaking a campaign, let one ( the king ) calculate the needed strength for the adventure, his own strength, his enemies' strength of resistance, and the strength of his helpers.
2. There is nothing impossible for him who knows the means of success and works it out.
3. Many ( kings ) have failed ( in war ) because they entered into it on account of excitement, without knowing ( the limitations of ) their own strength.
4. He, ( the king ) who is unfriendly with his neighbours has no knowledge of ( the limitations of ) his strength, and who constantly boasts will quickly come to ruin.
5. Even when filled with peacock's feathers, the cart's axle will break if it is overloaded.
6. He who climbs the topmost branch of a tree, if by excitement continues further will lose his life.
7. Giving in proportion to one's ability is the way to protect one's wealth.
8. It does not matter if the income is less, if the expenses do not exceed it.
9. The life of him who lives beyond his capacity, seeming to flourish will come to nought.
10. The wealth of him who gives without considering his ability to give, will soon exhaust.

## IL. Discerning Time

1. During daytime the crow beats kookai ( the stronger night bird ). Similarly kings need appropriate time to win.
2. Making use of opportune time is a rope that binds wealth.
3. Is there anything hard to do, if it is done at the fit time using appropriate instruments ?
4. The world one could gain if tried at the opportune time.
5. Those who would gain the world should wait patiently till fit time comes.
6. As the fighting goat draws back ( before pouncing ) even so the mighty one ( the king ) restrains.
7. The wise one will not show his anger outwardly; he will have it inside in his heart till the fit time.
8. Bend your head low when you see the enemy till such time his head falls.
9. Strive harder when the fit time arrives.
10. Pause like the crane while you wait and pounce like the crane while you act.

## NOTICE

Foreign (outside India) readers are invited to become permanent subscribers to THE INDIA CULTURES QUARTERLY, which aims to record factual information of use to students interested in the cultures of India. Please note the low annual fee which has been adjusted to the cost price of printing and mailing, on a non-profit basis.

Our advisers in foreign exchange have written to us that the simple expedient of mailing your personal cheque for two dollars only will be satisfactory at this end. Enclose this cheque in a sheet of heavy letter paper on which you have mentioned your name and address, and place in an envelope addressed to the Department of Organized Research, Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur, M. P., India. Place an eight cent postage stamp on this envelope, unless you wish to post by air mail. If you act now on this simple matter, your subscription will reach us in time for the next issue. Make cheques payable to Department of Organized Research of L. T. C. By using its initials, the name may be conveniently included in the space usually available on a bank cheque.

Readers in India are advised that the subscription fee is Rs. 2 for salaries of Rs. 200 or less, and Rs. 4 for salarie of Rs. 201 or more. Note that henceforth Dr. R. D. Immanuel will be in charge of editorial matters (as in the past), and Dr. H. H. Presler will be responsible for the Mid-India feature and assisting with the business details,

## KNOWLEDGE OF INDIA'S PEOPLE

In addition to publishing this magazine, the Department of Organized Research of Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur, M. P. India, acts as an arm of the Postgraduate School. Our curricula include the Master of Arts (Indian Philosophy), the Master of Theology (History of Religions, Hinduism), and the TWO YEAR CURRICULUM IN INDIA CULTURES, leading to our own Postgraduate diploma.

Each curriculum endeavours to relate the student to the contemporary life of the peoples of India, through empirical studies in the field. Approximately twenty hours per week are devoted to field work and the preparation of reports. All such studies occur in the Mid-India Region, and the student is encouraged to select and define his specific inquiry.

Courses in Theory and Methods of Social Research, Social Anthropology, the Psychology of Religion, the cultures of simple and complex societies are among the required subjects.

Prerequisite : Bachelor of Divinity Degree (Serampore) Second Division or its equivalent. Inquiries may be addressed to :

DR. H. H. PRESLER, Dean, Postgraduate School,
Leonard Theological College, Jabalpur, M. P., India.

Printed by : Edward Printing Press, Cantonment, Jabalpur, M. P.